

EXHIBIT 17

From: Elizabeth K. McCloskey <EMcCloskey@kvn.com>
Sent: Sunday, May 22, 2016 8:55 PM
To: Sara Jenkins; Amy Candido; Cisco-Arista; 'Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com' (Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com)
Cc: ARISTA-KVN; WSGR - Arista (Arista-WSGR@wsgr.com)
Subject: RE: Cisco v. Arista

Sara,

I write to follow up on our call Friday regarding Cisco's motion for a protective order. If Cisco files its motion on Monday, May 23, Arista will file its opposition within 14 days and would expect Cisco to file any reply within 7 days, pursuant to NDCA Local Rule 7-3. If Cisco prefers a longer briefing schedule, please propose such a schedule. As we discussed, if Cisco files its motion for a protective order tomorrow, Arista understands and agrees that Mr. Chambers' deposition will not go forward until the Court has ruled on Cisco's motion.

Also, I note that, Doug Gourlay provided on Friday additional testimony regarding Chambers' personal involvement in Cisco's competitive efforts against Arista. See Gourlay Rough at 146-50.

Thanks,
Lizzy

From: Sara Jenkins [mailto:sarajenkins@quinnemanuel.com]
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2016 3:03 PM
To: Amy Candido; Elizabeth K. McCloskey; Cisco-Arista; 'Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com' (Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com)
Cc: ARISTA-KVN; WSGR - Arista (Arista-WSGR@wsgr.com)
Subject: RE: Cisco v. Arista

Counsel,

Please let us know if Arista will agree to the proposal in Amy's letter from last night regarding the exchange of native Salesforce data today. Also, as I understand that Lizzy is currently in a deposition, please let us know if there is someone else who can meet and confer today regarding a briefing schedule for Cisco's motion for protective order.

Thank you,
Sara

From: Amy Candido
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 9:49 PM
To: 'Elizabeth K. McCloskey' <EMcCloskey@kvn.com>; Cisco-Arista <Cisco-Arista@quinnemanuel.com>; 'Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com' (<Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com>) <Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com>
Cc: ARISTA-KVN <ARISTA-KVN@kvn.com>; WSGR - Arista (<Arista-WSGR@wsgr.com>) <Arista-WSGR@wsgr.com>
Subject: RE: Cisco v. Arista

Lizzy,

Please see the attached response.

Amy

From: Elizabeth K. McCloskey [<mailto:EMcCloskey@kvn.com>]
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2016 7:12 PM
To: Amy Candido <amycandido@quinnemanuel.com>; Cisco-Arista <Cisco-Arista@quinnemanuel.com>; 'Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com' (<Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com> <Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com>)
Cc: ARISTA-KVN <ARISTA-KVN@kvn.com>; WSGR - Arista (<Arista-WSGR@wsgr.com> <Arista-WSGR@wsgr.com>)
Subject: RE: Cisco v. Arista

Amy,

Please confirm that Cisco intends to produce, no later than tomorrow, May 20, all responsive data from its Salesforce database and "database of competitive losses to Arista," Dashboards, customer presentations, and Deals Desk emails, among other categories set forth in our correspondence of May 16. Arista has asked Cisco, repeatedly, over the course of many months, to produce this data. To date, Cisco has never once disputed the relevance of this data, but has simply ignored Arista's requests for production. Arista has no interest in unnecessary motion practice, but at this point, Arista's damages expert cannot complete her report by the present deadline if Cisco continues to delay. Accordingly, as we've previously notified you, if Cisco refuses to complete production by May 20, Arista will file a motion to compel, seeking various forms of relief, including an extension of the deadline for Arista's damages expert report.

Thanks,
Lizzy

From: Amy Candido [<mailto:amycandido@quinnemanuel.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2016 3:16 PM
To: Elizabeth K. McCloskey; Cisco-Arista; 'Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com' (<Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com> <Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com>)
Cc: ARISTA-KVN; WSGR - Arista (<Arista-WSGR@wsgr.com> <Arista-WSGR@wsgr.com>)
Subject: RE: Cisco v. Arista

Lizzy,

We are working on a comprehensive response to your letter and, more importantly, we are working on providing dates for the remaining 30(b)(6) designees and completing our damages document production. Indeed, we are prioritizing providing Arista with discovery over providing you with correspondence. Accordingly, we are not in a position to get our response to your highly detailed five page letter to you by 5 pm today, and we do not think it was reasonable for you to demand such a response in less than 48 hours. In any event, I do not believe that the parties have disputes on these issues that require motion practice. Our response will be forthcoming as soon as possible.

Regards,
Amy

From: Elizabeth K. McCloskey [<mailto:EMcCloskey@kvn.com>]
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 9:34 PM
To: Cisco-Arista <Cisco-Arista@quinnemanuel.com>; 'Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com' (<Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com> <Cisco-AristaCopyrightTeam@kirkland.com>)
Cc: ARISTA-KVN <ARISTA-KVN@kvn.com>; WSGR - Arista (<Arista-WSGR@wsgr.com> <Arista-WSGR@wsgr.com>)
Subject: Cisco v. Arista

Please see the attached correspondence.

Elizabeth K. McCloskey

Attorney at Law

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

415 676 2269 direct | [vCard](#) | emccloskey@kvn.com

633 Battery Street, San Francisco, CA 94111-1809 | 415 391 5400 main | kvn.com